POST-AWARD ANNUAL BASELINE EVALUATION REPORT

Special Appropriation Projects
Assistance Programs Branch

Water Quality Protection Division: Region 6

Recipient: Village of Ruidoso, NM		Type of Evaluation: On-Site Evaluation: Off-site Evaluation:
Date of Evaluation: 12/16/08		Evaluation Location: (If On-Site)
EPA Project Officer: Nasim Jahan		Recipient Project Manager: S. Edens
Grant Number: XP966317-01		Project Start Date: 10/01/2006 Project End Date:
AWARD INFORMATION	ï	
EPA Share:	\$867,30	00
Recipient Share/Match:	\$709,60)9
Other:		
Total:	\$1,576,	909
Award Date:	6/30/20	006
SCOPE OF REVIEW: (Key topics covered)		
 Basic Project Information National Environmental Policy Act Plans and Specifications Progress of the Project Financial Status Other Information 		
Key Accomplishment: (See Append	dix 1)	
Attendance: (See Appendix 2)		
Follow-up Action Items: Yes (If yes, see Appendix 3)	No	X

PROJECT SUMMARY

1. Project Description. Study Planning Design Construction
Plan, design and construct a new wastewater treatment plant for Ruidoso and Ruidoso Downs, NM
2. Anticipated Environmental Benefits of Project.
The project will improve effluent quality to the point that the seasonal Rio Ruidoso River will maintain its pristine status. The project will allow the Village to be in compliance with the most current NPDES permit.
3. Amendments. Yes No S If yes, discuss the changes.
 4. Payment Status. Is Payment history consistent with progress to date? Yes □ No □ No Payments Requested ☒ No Payments Made □
No progress payments have been requested.

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT

Yes No Not Applicable Process Not Yet Started In Process Discussion:
Finding of No Significant Impact received 10/1/08
2. Does the project meet requirements as set forth in the Part 6 for the environmental review? Yes No Not Applicable Discussion:
3. Is the Grantee in compliance with the Archeological and Historic Preservation Act and the National Historic Preservation Act? Yes No Not Applicable Discussion:
4. Is the Grantee in compliance with the Endangered Species Act? Yes ☑ No ☐ Not Applicable ☐ Discussion:
5. Is the Grantee in compliance with the other applicable Federal Environmental cross-cutting laws and authorities? Yes No Not Applicable Discussion:

PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS

1. Is the Grantee in compliance with requirements as set forth in the Part 31.32, Equipment, Material and Supplies? Yes No Not Applicable Discussion:
WWTP will be owned, maintained and operated by the Village of Ruidoso and City of Ruidoso Downs.
 2. Do the Grantee's service and/or construction contracts meet requirements as set forth in the Part 31.36, Procurement? Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Applicable ☒ Discussion:
3. Is the Grantee in compliance with MBE/WBE requirements? Yes No Not Applicable Discussion:
4. Does the project meet standard as required by the Part 7, Nondiscrimination in Programs, fo the disability in the design and construction? Yes No Not Applicable Discussion:
5. Do the Grantee's service and/or construction contracts meet requirements as set forth in the Part 31.38, Indian Self Determination Act? Yes No Not Applicable - no contract awarded by Indian Tribe or Indian Intertribal Consortium Discussion: Does not apply to this project
LOCS HOLADORY ID HIIS DEUICOL

6. Is the Grantee in compliance with applicable requirements as set forth in the Part 32, Government wide Debarment and Suspension and Government wide Requirements for Drug-Free workplace? Yes No Not Applicable Discussion:
7. Are the Plans and Specifications/Bid Documents complete? Yes No Not Applicable Not Required Not Yet Received Discussion:
Plans and specs are at 95% completion with review of plan set sheduled January 2009.

PROGRESS OF THE PROJECT

1. Is the work under the agreement on schedule? Yes No Discussion:
Since getting back on schedule the project is proceeding according to plan. Original confusion on project scope and direction caused significant delays in project commencement.
2. Is the actual work being performed within the scope of the recipient=s work plan? Yes No Discussion:
Design continues on track with project scope,.
3. Are the products/progress reports submitted on time as specified in grant award? Yes No Not Applicable Discussion:
4. Has the recipient initiated construction?
Yes No Not Applicable - no construction being preformed Discussion:
Advertisement for bid anticipated in February or March 2009

FINANCIAL STATUS

1. Does the Grantee provide sufficient local share including in-kind contribution?
Yes No
Discussion:
No funding disbursements have been made to date.
2. Is the Grantee in compliance with requirements as set forth in the Part 31.25 or Part 30.24, Program Income, as applicable?
Yes No Not Applicable - no income anticipated Discussion:
3. Is the Grantee submitting payment requests in a timely manner?
Yes No No Payments Requested
Discussion:

OTHER INFORMATION

1. Does the project meet requirement as set forth in the Part 29 concerning the single point contact?
Yes No Not Applicable
Discussion:
Dan Higgins, City Manager, is the single point of contact
2. Is the Grantee in compliance with requirements as set forth in the Part 31.31, Real Property and the Uniform Relocation and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act? Yes No Not Applicable - no property being acquired Discussion:
City owns the property on which project is being constructed.
3. Is the Grantee in compliance with applicable requirements as set forth in the Part 34, New Restrictions on Lobbying? Yes No Not Applicable Discussion:
 4. Is the Grantee in compliance with the Hotel and Motel Fire Safety Act of 1990 for all conference, meeting, convention or training space? Yes □ No □ Not Applicable ☒ Discussion:

Appendix 1

KEY ACCOMPLISHMENTS

1. Coordination with other EPA STAG grants (XP96657101 and XP9763070-1) to design and construct complete WWTP goes well with Ph IB scheduled to advertise February 2009.

APPENDIX 2

ATTENDANCE

	NAME	AGENCY	PHONE
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			

APPENDIX 3

FOLLOW-UP ACTION ITEMS

ACTION ITEM	RESPONSIBILITY	DUE DATE
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		